



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

---

## WHY HE VOTED FOR NORRIS

SIR,—I have just read your comment in the November REVIEW on the candidacy of George W. Norris of Nebraska for re-election to the United States Senate. I have read your WAR WEEKLY and the REVIEW right along and can readily see that the action of Nebraska in sending Norris back to Washington must look, to you, something like insanity. So it was, but the insanity must be looked for elsewhere as well as in Nebraska. Some of us helped send Norris back to Washington, open-eyed, knowing what outsiders would think, knowing they would have good cause for thinking ill of us, not knowing fully the causes. None of us, up to date, has expressed any regret, and I apprehend none of us will do so in the future. But I think it is due to Nebraska that judgment should be based upon knowledge of the whole situation as it was when Nebraska voters went to the polls.

I, personally, wrote Mr. Norris, after his foolish and disgraceful disloyal votes and talks in the Senate, that I withdrew every good opinion I had ever had of him and wished I could withdraw every vote I had ever given him. I believe he ought to have been kicked out of the Senate on two counts, imbecility and disloyalty, but I voted for him at the election just the same, after voting against him at the primaries.

Will you please tell me what was left for a self-respecting Republican voter to do? I (when I speak of myself I do so simply because it is easier than to speak of the thousand others who did the same) was in favor of preparedness along rational lines before there was any war. I believed in being reasonably prepared because everybody, except our so-called idealists,—which simply means persons unable to weigh evidence and recognize facts,—knew the danger and knew where it was. Nobody with even ordinary commonsense had any right to be in doubt about it. I believed in preparedness when it was denounced as hysteria, when a War Secretary who believed in it was dismissed and one chosen who naively admitted that he was amazed to learn that every army officer was not spoiling for a fight, in the face of our history which ought to be known to every school boy. I am no hidebound Republican, scarcely ever voting a straight Republican ticket. I was a Progressive and still swear by the Progressive platform, was and am loyal to America to the last gasp, and tried to be loyal to every changing attitude of the Administration because it *was* the Administration, the only Government we had. I saved, urged others to save, paid, subscribed, made speeches, wore old clothes, ate what I could get and tried to be cheerful even when ordered (not requested) to give more,—more time, more money, more sacrifice in

every way, and the orders often coming from someone who had been blind, deaf and dumb to the danger till it was right upon us.

After all that, I thought, being rational and not under tutelage in any way, I might be permitted to vote as I thought best. When told that loyalty required that I vote for Democratic dummies, I simply voted for Republicans, just because they *were* Republicans, something I had never done before, and I did it not out of resentment or anger, but coldly, calmly, calculatedly, because I knew that my duty to self and country required that I do so. I believed from the very first that America ought to be in the war on the side of the Allies with all her force, with all her power, with all her might; and that her power and might ought to be augmented and increased to the limit, yet I voted for a man who showed himself not only disloyal but silly, as the least of two evils. Thousands of others did likewise, and that is part of the explanation for Norris of Nebraska.

But it is not all the explanation, by any manner of means. There is a strong German vote in Nebraska, and that vote went to Norris, as we knew it would. We knew that was partly why Norris voted and acted as he did in the Senate, and you may know something of the feeling among the voters when thousands of upstanding Americans voted with them, as I know they did, Republicans, Progressives, and a great many Democrats. If you think we enjoyed it and have jollified greatly over it, come out to Nebraska and talk with almost any Republican or Progressive. We are not through with Mr. Norris, and if he thinks the vote indicates approval of his course, except by Germans, he would better do some more thinking. And if the Germans in Nebraska think it means any approval of their course in the past, there is going to be a great opening of eyes before long.

Other reasons? Lots of them. Nebraska is progressive, is against the extreme or old-line Republicans with their high tariff, individualistic, corporation-ridden bosses. Nebraska believes strongly in the square deal and the strongest Republican leaders are well in the van of progressive thought. You speak highly of Ex-Governor Morehead. I do not know it to be a fact, but it was very positively and openly asserted by Democratic politicians, who were for Norris, that Morehead in a published interview approved of everything Norris did when the filibuster was on. Morehead is not progressive and Morehead is not able, not in Norris's class in either respect. When the people of Omaha thought they wanted to hitch up the power that gives them water, and get electric light much cheaper, Mr. Morehead thought they weren't even entitled to vote on it, and he vetoed the bill worked through both Houses of the legislature by a former Republican candidate for Governor. The most common term applied to Morehead by forward-looking Republicans and Democrats alike is, "Mossback." When Morehead was Governor, Roosevelt attended a banquet in Lincoln, and Morehead, who presided, had to have the fifty or so words of welcome to a distinguished ex-President typed, and held it before him and read it in the sing-song tones of a schoolboy. This I saw and heard. He is not a man of ability, not a man to captivate or attract at all.

Morehead has always trained with the Hitchcock Democrats, and the Hitchcock Democrats were the pro-German, pro-whiskey Democrats up to very recently. Thinking people find little choice between a man

who speaks out as Norris did and one who has simply taken cover. I am one of those who think Senator Hitchcock did valiant work in jarring Baker out of his peaceful slumbers, but we cannot so soon forget that Hitchcock was believed to play the German game and to have been elected by the German whiskey vote. You see, it isn't all so simple as it looks a couple of thousand miles away. Leaving the war out of the question, thinking men would choose Norris ten to one over Morehead, for ability, for character, for sympathy, for almost anything you wish to name, not excepting candor and straight dealing.

Also there was another reason. Because Morehead was a Hitchcock man, the Bryan Democrats were mainly against him and for Norris. They were naturally for Norris anyway, because Bryan Democrats are natural pacifists. They thought Norris was right, they really believed that when Germany ordered us to stay at home or be shot, we should have meekly stayed at home. Of course they voted for Norris. That didn't make it any easier for aggressive loyalists to vote for him, but we had to do it. Easy? Why, I personally couldn't bring myself to make a cross opposite Norris's name. The only way I could do it was to make a cross in the Republican circle and quit. There were some Democrats on the ticket I would have voted for ordinarily, but I did not feel capable of selecting, because that would have made it necessary to *select* Norris. I was voting Republican because I had been ordered not to do so.

I could go on all day giving excuses. The assinenity of the Republicans in putting up at the primaries two men to divide the loyal vote, neither of them acceptable to the great mass of the voters, cut considerable figure. At that, they got almost twice as many votes as Norris at the primaries, showing that, with just a little sense, even the President's letter would not have put Republicans up against such a choice. One thing at a time, however. This is a democratic republic, a constitutional republic. The founders thereof intended a Congress of men, not ninnies or rubber-stamps. When the time came to emphasize that fact, it was done. If in doing it we had to send to Washington a Norris or two, that's a mere incident—one Senator is not very dangerous, no matter how big a fool he may be.

Anyhow, Michigan didn't send Ford. That ought to be sufficient for gratitude this Thanksgiving day.

OMAHA, NEB.

H. W. MORROW.

#### FROM A RETURNING SOLDIER

SIR,—Your article in the October issue entitled, "A Judas Peace," is interesting and truthful, and as I am a returning wounded soldier, I believe I am able to know and speak on it.

The Huns would bomb towns and cities of no military importance, killing civilians and children for no other reason than devilishness.

When the Allies started making reprisals by bombing German towns there was a torrent of abuse cast at us threatening punishment to captured prisoners, and to some extent these threats were carried out.

The Huns were bombing London and they asked their English prisoners what their people thought of the air raids. The prisoners calmly remarked that they were already planning for the protection of London